

Bureau of Land Management

[AZ-930-07-1020-00]

Notice of Availability of a Proposed Plan Amendment of Land Use Plans in Arizona for Implementation of Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration, Finding of No Significant Impact, and Environmental Assessment Summary**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.**ACTION:** Notice of availability, amendment to time frames for protest period.

SUMMARY: On March 11, 1997, the Bureau of Land Management published a notice of availability of the proposed plan amendment of land use plans in Arizona for implementation of Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration. The publication of the Notice of Availability initiated a 30-day protest period of the proposed plan amendment. This notice serves to announce an amendment to the time frames for the protest period. Due to a delay in publishing the original **Federal Register** Notice of Availability, the protest period will not close until April 9, 1997.

DATES: Protests on the proposed decisions in the Proposed Plan Amendment for Implementation of Arizona Standards and Guidelines must be postmarked by April 9, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Protests must be sent to the Director (210); Bureau of Land Management; 1849 C Street, NW; MS-1000LS; Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken Mahoney, Team Leader, Arizona State Office, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85004, Telephone: (602) 417-9238.

Phillip D. Moreland,

Acting Deputy State Director, Arizona.

[FR Doc. 97-6890 Filed 3-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**Summary of Commission Practice Relating to Administrative Protective Orders**

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Summary of Commission practice relating to administrative protective orders.

SUMMARY: The Conference Report to the Customs and Trade Act of 1990

provided for the International Trade Commission ("Commission") to issue periodic reports, at least annually, on the status of its practice with respect to violations of its administrative protective orders ("APOs") in investigations under Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930. This notice provides a summary of investigations of breaches for the period ending in 1996. The Commission intends that this notice will educate representatives of parties to Commission proceedings as to some specific types of APO breaches encountered by the Commission and the corresponding types of actions the Commission has taken.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gail S. Usher, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, tel. (202) 205-3152. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Representatives of parties to investigations conducted under Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 may enter into administrative protective orders that permit them, under strict conditions, to obtain access to business proprietary information ("BPI") of other parties. See 19 U.S.C. 1677f; 19 CFR 207.7. The discussion below describes APO breach investigations that the Commission has completed including a description of actions taken in response to breaches. The discussion covers breach investigations completed during the period ending in 1996, generally with respect to antidumping and countervailing duty cases.

In past years, the notice has contained also a summary of the Commission's investigations involving violations of the "24-hour" rule, which provides that during the 24-hour period after a Commission deadline for a party submission in an antidumping or countervailing duty proceeding, the only changes to the proprietary version permitted are changes to the bracketing of BPI. See 19 CFR 207.3(c). In 1996, however, no investigations of 24-hour rule violations were completed.

In recent years, the Commission has expanded the notice to include APO breaches in other types of proceedings as well. In 1996, only one APO investigation was completed in a proceeding conducted under Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974, and no APO investigations were completed in proceedings conducted under Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Since 1991, the Commission has published annually a summary of its actions in response to violations of Commission APOs and the "24 hour" rule. See 56 FR 4846 (Feb. 6, 1991); 57 FR 12,335 (Apr. 9, 1992); 58 FR 21,991 (Apr. 26, 1993); 59 FR 16,834 (Apr. 8, 1994); 60 FR 24,880 (May 10, 1995); and 61 FR 21,203 (May 9, 1996). This notice does not provide an exclusive list of conduct that will be deemed to be a breach of the Commission's APOs, and does not bind the Commission in its future rulings.

As part of the effort to educate practitioners about the Commission's current APO practice, the Secretary of the Commission issued in April 1996 a revised edition of *An Introduction to Administrative Protective Order Practice in Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations* (Pub. No. 2961). This document is available upon request from the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20436, tel. (202) 205-2000.

I. In General

The current APO form for antidumping and countervailing duty investigations, which the Commission has used since March 1995, requires the applicant to swear that he or she will:

(1) Not divulge any of the BPI obtained under this APO and not otherwise available to him, to any person other than

(i) Personnel of the Commission concerned with the investigation,

(ii) The person or agency from whom the BPI was obtained,

(iii) A person whose application for disclosure of BPI under this APO has been granted by the Secretary, and

(iv) Other persons, such as paralegals and clerical staff, who (a) are employed or supervised by and under the direction and control of the authorized applicant or another authorized applicant in the same firm whose application has been granted; (b) have a need thereof in connection with the investigation; (c) are not involved in competitive decision making for an interested party which is a party to the investigation; and (d) have submitted to the Secretary a signed Acknowledgment for Clerical Personnel in the form attached hereto (the authorized applicant shall also sign such acknowledgment and will be deemed responsible for such persons' compliance with this APO);

(2) Use such BPI solely for the purposes of the above-captioned Commission investigation or for judicial or binational panel review of such Commission investigation;

(3) Not consult with any person not described in paragraph (1) concerning BPI disclosed under this APO without first having received the written consent of the Secretary and the party or the representative of the party from whom such BPI was obtained;

(4) Whenever materials (e.g., documents, computer disks, etc.) containing such BPI are not being used, store such material in a locked file cabinet, vault, safe, or other suitable container (N.B.: storage of BPI on so-called hard disk computer media is to be avoided, because mere erasure of data from such media may not irrecoverably destroy the BPI and may result in violation of paragraph C of this APO);

(5) Serve all materials containing BPI disclosed under this APO as directed by the Secretary and pursuant to section 207.7(f) of the Commission's rules;

(6) Transmit each document containing BPI disclosed under this APO:

(i) with a cover sheet identifying the document as containing BPI,

(ii) with all BPI enclosed in brackets and each page warning that the document contains BPI,

(iii) if the document is to be filed by a deadline, with each page marked "Bracketing of BPI not final for one business day after date of filing," and

(iv) if by mail, within two envelopes, the inner one sealed and marked "Business Proprietary Information—To be opened only by [name of recipient]", and the outer one sealed and not marked as containing BPI;

(7) Comply with the provisions of this APO and section 207.7 of the Commission's rules;

(8) Make true and accurate representations in the authorized applicant's application and promptly notify the Secretary of any changes that occur after the submission of the application and that affect the representations made in the application (e.g., change in personnel assigned to the investigation);

(9) Report promptly and confirm in writing to the Secretary any possible breach of this APO; and

(10) Acknowledge that breach of this APO may subject the authorized applicant and other persons to such sanctions or other actions as the Commission deems appropriate, including the administrative sanctions and actions set out in this APO.

The APO further provides that breach of a protective order may subject an applicant to:

(1) Disbarment from practice in any capacity before the Commission along with such person's partners, associates,

employer, and employees, for up to seven years following publication of a determination that the order has been breached;

(2) Referral to the United States Attorney;

(3) In the case of an attorney, accountant, or other professional, referral to the ethics panel of the appropriate professional association;

(4) Such other administrative sanctions as the Commission determines to be appropriate, including public release of or striking from the record any information or briefs submitted by, or on behalf of, such person or the party he represents; denial of further access to business proprietary information in the current or any future investigations before the Commission; and issuance of a public or private letter of reprimand; and

(5) Such other actions, including but not limited to, a warning letter, as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

Commission employees are not signatories to the Commission's APOs and do not obtain access to BPI through APO procedure. Consequently, they are not subject to the requirements of the APO with respect to the handling of BPI. However, Commission employees are subject to strict statutory and regulatory constraints concerning BPI, and face potentially severe penalties for noncompliance. See 18 U.S.C. 1905; Title 5, U.S. Code; and Commission personnel policies implementing the statutes. Although the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) limits the Commission's authority to disclose any personnel action against agency employees, this should not lead the public to conclude that no such actions have been taken.

An important provision of the Commission's rules relating to BPI is the "24-hour" rule. This rule provides that parties have one business day after the deadline for filing documents containing BPI to file a public version of the document. The rule also permits changes to the bracketing of information in the proprietary version within this one-day period. No changes—other than changes in bracketing—may be made to the proprietary version. The rule was intended to reduce the incidence of APO breaches caused by inadequate bracketing and improper placement of BPI. The Commission urges parties to make use of the rule. If a party wishes to make changes to a document other than bracketing, such as typographical changes or other corrections, the party must ask for an extension of time to file an amended document pursuant to Rule 201.14(b)(2).

II. Investigations of Alleged APO Breaches

An investigation of an alleged APO breach in an antidumping or countervailing duty investigation commences when the Secretary, acting under delegated authority, issues to the alleged breacher a letter of inquiry to ascertain the alleged breacher's views on whether a breach has occurred. If, after reviewing the response and other relevant information, the Commission determines that a breach has occurred, the Commission often issues a second letter asking the breacher to address the questions of mitigating or aggravating circumstances and possible sanctions or other actions. The Commission then determines what action to take in response to the breach. However, in some cases, the Commission has determined that although a breach has occurred, sanctions are not warranted, and therefore has found it unnecessary to issue a second letter concerning what sanctions might be appropriate. Instead, it issues a warning letter to the individual. The Commission retains sole authority to make final determinations regarding the existence of a breach and the appropriate action to be taken if a breach has occurred.

The records of Commission investigations of alleged APO breaches in antidumping and countervailing duty cases are not publicly available and are exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552; Section 135(b) of the Customs and Trade Act of 1990; and 19 U.S.C. 1677f(g).

The breach most frequently investigated by the Commission involves the APO's prohibition on the dissemination of BPI to unauthorized persons. Such dissemination usually occurs as the result of failure to delete BPI from public versions of documents filed with the Commission or of transmission of proprietary versions of documents to unauthorized recipients. Other breaches have involved: the failure to properly bracket BPI in proprietary documents filed with the Commission; the failure to immediately report known violations of an APO; and the failure to adequately supervise non-legal personnel in the handling of BPI in certain circumstances.

Sanctions for APO violations serve two basic interests: (a) preserving the confidence of submitters of BPI in the Commission as a reliable protector of BPI; and (b) disciplining breachers and deterring future violations. As the Conference Report to the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 observed, "the effective enforcement of

limited disclosure under administrative protective order depends in part on the extent to which private parties have confidence that there are effective sanctions against violation." H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 576, 100th Cong., 1st Sess. 623 (1988).

The Commission has worked to develop consistent jurisprudence, not only in determining whether a breach has occurred, but also in selecting an appropriate response. In determining the appropriate response, the Commission generally considers mitigating factors such as the unintentional nature of the breach, the lack of prior breaches committed by the breaching party, the corrective measures taken by the breaching party, and the promptness with which the breaching party reported the violation to the Commission. The Commission also considers aggravating circumstances, especially whether persons not under the APO actually read the BPI.

Commission rules permit economists or consultants to obtain access to BPI under the APO if the economist or consultant is under the direction and control of an attorney under the APO, or if the economist or consultant appears regularly before the Commission and represents an interested party who is a party to the investigation. 19 CFR 207.7(a)(3) (B) and (C). Economists and consultants who obtain access to BPI under the APO under the direction and control of an attorney nonetheless remain individually responsible for complying with the APO. In appropriate circumstances, for example, an economist under the direction and control of an attorney may be held responsible for a breach of the APO by failing to redact APO information from a document that is subsequently filed with the Commission and served as a public document. This is so even though the attorney exercising direction or control over the economist or consultant may also be held responsible for the breach of the APO.

III. Specific Investigations in Which Breaches Were Found

The Commission presents the following case studies to educate users about the types of APO breaches found by the Commission. The case studies provide the factual background, the actions taken by the Commission, and the factors considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate actions. The Commission has not included some of the specific facts in the descriptions of investigations where disclosure could reveal the identity of a particular breacher. Thus, in some cases, apparent

inconsistencies in the facts set forth in this notice result from the Commission's inability to disclose particular facts more fully.

Case 1: Counsel bracketed but failed to redact BPI in the public version of its pre-hearing brief. The Commission found that two of the signatories to the brief breached the APO and issued private letters of reprimand. In deciding on this sanction, the Commission considered that the breach was discovered by the Commission, not by the offending parties, and the brief containing BPI was in fact released and copied by an unauthorized person. On the other hand, the attorneys had committed no prior breaches of an APO; the breach did not appear to be intentional; the attorneys moved promptly to mitigate the breach; and the attorneys cooperated in a timely and complete manner. (The Commission found that a third signatory did not breach the APO because he was not involved in the preparation of the brief).

Case 2: In a final investigation, counsel served a document containing BPI information on four parties' representatives that were signatories to the APO in the preliminary investigation, but were not signatories in the final investigation.¹ The Commission found that the party responsible for serving the document breached the APO, but decided to issue only a warning letter. Factors relevant to the Commission's decision included that the breach was inadvertent; the offender did not commit any prior APO breaches; the offender took immediate actions to mitigate any harm by retrieving the documents from the unauthorized recipients; and the document was not viewed by anyone not on the APO.

Case 3: A junior associate and an attorney with principal responsibility for an investigation ("principal attorney") submitted certifications that all APO information had been returned or destroyed. Both attorneys subsequently changed firms. Thereafter, an employee at the principal attorney's new firm located two documents obtained under the APO in the principal attorney's files. The principal attorney notified the Commission. The Commission found that both the junior associate and the principal attorney

breached the APO by (1) failing to return or destroy all documents containing BPI; and (2) certifying that they had done so when in fact documents had not been returned or destroyed. The Commission found that the principal attorney breached the APO also by not safeguarding BPI material such that a non-APO signatory—the employee who discovered the documents—had access to APO information. The Commission decided to issue private letters of reprimand to both the junior associate and the principal attorney.

The Commission rejected the junior associate's assertions that he did not breach the APO because he was not permitted access to all of the files at his firm. The Commission stated that if this was the case, the associate should have asked other signatories whether they had returned or destroyed all BPI. As for the sanction, the Commission noted that the filing of an incorrect certification of destruction of documents is a serious violation of an APO. On the other hand, the Commission noted that the attorney had not previously breached an APO; the violation was not intentional; and the breach occurred at a time when the affairs of the firm were in disarray due to significant organizational changes at the firm.

As for the principal attorney, the Commission considered that a false certification of destruction is a serious breach; the attorney was the one principally responsible for representing clients in this particular investigation; and there was the additional breach of making BPI available to a non-APO signatory. On the other hand, the Commission noted that the attorney had not previously breached an APO; the breach was not intentional; and the affairs of the firm were in disarray due to significant organizational changes at the firm.

Case 4: Three attorneys subject to an APO left their firm during the pendency of the appeal process of an investigation, while a fourth remained at the firm. Accordingly, when the three departed, the firm still possessed BPI under the APO. One of the three asserted that he thought that the fourth attorney would be responsible for the APO material; another asserted that he left instructions for the documents to be sent to the client's new law firm or be destroyed; while the third asserted that the material was not destroyed at the time of his departure because the litigation was still ongoing. All parties to the case then entered a stipulation dismissing all pending litigation. A year later, upon departure from the firm or shortly thereafter, the fourth attorney

¹ These references correspond to the preliminary and final phases of an investigation under the Commission's amended rules. See 19 CFR 207.12, 61 FR 37,818, 37819 (July 22, 1996). In this case, and in other cases discussed in this notice, the investigations were conducted under the Commission's pre-existing rules, which termed such proceedings to be preliminary and final investigations.

asserted that he learned that the documents still were in the firm's locked APO room, instructed his secretary to destroy them, and conferred with her thereafter to ensure that the instructions had been followed. Three years later, this attorney was informed by personnel at this firm that material obtained pursuant to the APO was still in the firm's locked APO room. He promptly reported this to the Commission.

The Commission found that all four attorneys breached the APO by failing to return or destroy all documents containing BPI obtained under APO. The Commission also found that the fourth attorney further breached the APO by failing to ascertain that any instructions he had given to destroy documents containing BPI had been executed, a failure which resulted in BPI being retained by individuals who were neither APO signatories nor under the control of APO signatories.

The Commission decided to issue private letters of reprimand to each of the attorneys. The Commission noted that the failure of the attorneys to communicate adequately with each other concerning who would have the ultimate responsibility for disposing of the APO materials was a serious breach of their obligations, and that it resulted in the failure to return or destroy APO material. The Commission also noted that none of the parties had previously breached an APO.

Case 5: Counsel filed the public version of a document that contained bracketed but unredacted BPI. The Commission found that the economic consultant who was responsible for the exhibits that contained the unredacted BPI, as well as three attorneys acting as counsel for the same party (one as a contract attorney for the retained firm) who had all worked on the brief and reviewed the brief for BPI, had breached the APO. In deciding to issue only warning letters to the economic consultant and to the three attorneys, the Commission noted the following: the breach was inadvertent; the offenders had not been found to have previously breached an APO; they took actions to mitigate any harm by ensuring that all unauthorized parties returned or destroyed the BPI; and it did not appear that the BPI was in fact viewed by any unauthorized persons.

The Commission simultaneously investigated another potential breach by one of the attorneys—that testimony he gave at a hearing involved BPI. The Commission determined that no breach occurred because the information had been previously publicly disclosed in

the companion Commerce proceeding by the party whose BPI was at issue.

Case 6: Counsel filed and served a brief whose proprietary version contained BPI that was not bracketed and whose public version contained the same unbracketed, unredacted BPI. The Commission found that the attorney with responsibility for performing the initial review of the public and proprietary versions of the brief and the partner who signed the brief and accepted overall responsibility for compliance with the APO breached the APO. (The Commission found that two other attorneys at the firm did not breach the APO because they were not involved in the preparation of the brief. The Commission also found that a legal assistant responsible for redacting the BPI did not breach the protective order because he properly redacted all BPI that had been bracketed). The Commission issued warning letters to both attorneys, noting that the breach was inadvertent; they had not previously breached the APO; they took actions to mitigate any harm; and it did not appear that the BPI was viewed by any unauthorized persons.

Case 7: Counsel failed to redact BPI in two submissions, one filed a week after the first. The Commission found that the partner responsible for redacting BPI from both submissions and an associate responsible for redacting BPI from one of the submissions breached the APO. (The Commission found that a third signatory to the brief did not violate the APO because he was not involved in the preparation of the brief). The Commission issued a private letter of reprimand to the partner and a warning letter to the associate.

The Commission considered that the Commission, not the offenders, discovered the breaches, and the breaches were not fully cured because it was not known whether unauthorized recipients actually viewed the BPI. In addition, with respect to the partner, the Commission pointed to the fact that two separate breaches occurred. On the other hand, the Commission noted that the breaches appeared to be inadvertent; neither offender had previously breached an APO; upon learning of the breaches, the offenders moved promptly to mitigate any harm; and they otherwise cooperated with the Commission. In addition, the associate was involved with only one of the breaches and did not have ultimate responsibility for review of the entire submission that the associate did help prepare.

Case 8: A trade specialist who was subject to the direction and control of an attorney received a public and

proprietary version of a hearing transcript and gave them to a secretary for copying and distribution. The secretary sent a copy of the proprietary version to an individual not authorized to receive APO information.

The Commission found that the attorney who had responsibility for ensuring the compliance with the APO by the clerical staff breached the APO by failing to arrange for adequate supervision of the handling of BPI. It decided to issue a private letter of reprimand to him and imposed a requirement that in the next investigation in which the attorney appears before the Commission in which he seeks APO status, that either (1) he certify that he has provided written instructions to clerical and support staff at his firm handling BPI materials that no BPI is to be transmitted without his personal approval; or (2) the firm designate another attorney to be lead APO counsel. In making its decision, the Commission noted that the attorney had two prior APO violations. On the other hand, the Commission noted that his conduct did not rise to the level of willful misbehavior or gross negligence characteristic of investigations where the Commission has issued public letters of reprimand; and no BPI was viewed by any unauthorized persons.

The Commission also found that the secretary, by sending the transcript to a non-APO signatory, had breached the APO and issued a warning letter. The Commission noted that it was departing from its normal practice of not holding clerical employees responsible for APO breaches because the secretary sent the transcript to an individual whom she knew was not permitted to receive APO information. However, the Commission noted the presence of mitigating factors: she had not previously breached an APO; the breach was inadvertent; and no BPI was actually viewed by any unauthorized persons.

The Commission found that the trade specialist breached the APO because he had supervisory responsibility on the day in question for overseeing the distribution of the proprietary version of the transcript. In issuing a warning letter, the Commission noted that he was the firm's APO coordinator responsible for distribution of APO materials; and that at the time the breach occurred, he was called away from the office and made no provision for anyone at the firm to assume his responsibilities. However, the Commission also noted that he had not previously breached an APO; the breach was inadvertent; and no BPI was

actually viewed by unauthorized persons.

Case 9: Three attorneys prepared and filed the public version of a brief that contained bracketed but unredacted BPI and served copies of the brief to parties on the public service list and to other non-authorized persons. The Commission found that these attorneys breached the APO and decided to issue a warning letter to each of the attorneys. (The Commission also found that two other attorneys whose name appeared on the brief did not breach the APO because they did not assist in the preparation of the public version of the brief at issue). In making its decision, the Commission noted that the breach was inadvertent; the attorneys had not previously breached an APO; they took immediate action to mitigate the harm; they immediately reported the potential breach to the Commission; and it did not appear that the BPI was actually read by any unauthorized persons.

IV. Specific Investigations in Which No Breach Was Found

As noted above, in three investigations where the Commission found a breach by one or more parties, it also found that one or more parties investigated did not breach the APO. In addition, the Commission completed one investigation in 1996 in which it found that no breach by any party had occurred. In that investigation, the Commission reached its conclusion on the basis of a finding that the BPI in question, which was petitioner's BPI, had previously been publicly disclosed by the petitioners.

V. Investigations of Breaches Other Than in Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Proceedings

In 1996, the Commission conducted one investigation of an alleged breach of an APO in a proceeding brought pursuant to Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974. In that investigation, an APO signatory sent the proprietary version of a brief to a party on the public service list that was not a party to the APO. The Commission found that the signatory breached the APO. In deciding to issue only a warning letter, the Commission pointed to the following factors: the breach was inadvertent; the signatory had not previously breached an APO; the signatory took actions to mitigate any harm by retrieving the unopened envelope containing the brief; and thus it did not appear that any unauthorized persons viewed the BPI.

During 1996, the Commission did not conduct any investigations of breaches of APOs in proceedings filed under Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 13, 1997.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-6904 Filed 3-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: March 28, 1997 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, DC 20436.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meeting.
 2. Minutes.
 3. Ratification List.
 4. Inv. No. 731-TA-760 (Preliminary) (Needle Bearing Wire from Japan)—briefing and vote.
 5. Outstanding action jackets: none
- In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

Issued: March 13, 1997.

By order of the Commission:

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-6996 Filed 3-17-97; 9:57 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Attorney Personnel Management

Justice Management Division

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Reinstatement, Without Change, of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval has Expired

ACTION: Application Booklets—Attorney General's Honor Program, Summer Law Intern Program, Law Student Program.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval is sought for the information collection listed below. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** and allowed 60 days for public comment.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments from the date listed at the top of this page in the **Federal Register**. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 Code of Federal Regulation, Part

1320.10. Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to 202-395-7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to 202-514-1534. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency/component, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies/components estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) Type of information collection: Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

(2) The title of the form/collection: Application Booklets—Attorney General's Honor Program, Summer Law Intern Program, Law Student Program.

(3) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection. Form number: None. Office of Attorney Personnel Management, Justice Management Division, United States Department of Justice.